DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 152 980 CE 015 147

AUTHOR Zurhellen, Joan H.
TITLE Comparison of Students in Three Different Levels of Nursing Education on Biographical, Cognitive Structure, Perception of Environment, Personality-Value Structure and Attitudes toward Nursing.
SPONS AGENCY Health Resources Administration (DHEW/PHS), Bethesda, Md. Div. of Nursing.
PUB DATE Mar 78
GRANT 5-D10-NU-00893
NOTE 62p.; Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Toronto, Canada, March 27-31, 1978); Some pages of this document may not reproduce well due to broken type in the original

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Associate Degrees; Bachelors Degrees; Biographical Inventories; Cognitive Style; Environmental Influences; Individual Characteristics; Learning Characteristics; Measurement Instruments; *Medical Education; *Nursing; Personality Assessment; Post Secondary Education; Statistical Analysis; *Student Attitudes; *Student Evaluation; Work Attitudes

ABSTRACT

A comparison was made of nursing students entering five nursing schools (three diploma programs, one associate degree program, and one baccalaureate) in the Memphis, Tennessee, area in 1974 and 1975. The study was undertaken to compare nursing students in three levels of nursing education on five clusters of variables deemed to influence learning characteristics, style, and outcome and, hence, also the clinical competencies and attitudes which might be expected of the three types of R.N. graduates. The variable clusters studied were biographical, personality values, cognitive structure, environmental perception and reaction, and attitudes toward nursing. Five instruments were used for data collection. Results indicate little difference between the nursing students of the three levels at the beginning of their programs, during the course of their programs, or at graduation. (Data tables and copies of the instruments are included.) (BB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED152980

COMPARISON OF STUDENTS IN THREE DIFFERENT LEVELS OF NURSING EDUCATION ON BIOGRAPHICAL, COGNITIVE STRUCTURE, PERCEPTION OF ENVIRONMENT, PERSONALITY-VALUE STRUCTURE AND ATTITUDES TOWARD NURSING

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

By

Joan H. Zurhellen, Ed.D.

The study contained herein was undertaken as part of the project, "Planning for Consortia Utilization of a Nursing Core Curriculum," supported by DHEW grant, 5 D10 NU 00893, Division of Nursing, USPHS, during the period July 1, 1974-June 30, 1977.

Paper presented at the annual meeting
of the American Educational Research Association
Toronto, Canada, March 27-31, 1978

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Joan H. Zurhellen

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Printed in the U.S.A.

CE 015 147

ABSTRACT

This study was undertaken to compare nursing students in three levels of nursing education programs on five clusters of variables deemed to influence learning characteristics, style and outcome and, hence, also to affect the clinical competincies and attitudes which might be expected of the three types of R.N. graduates. The variable clusters studied were biographical, personality-values, cognitive structure, environmental perception/reaction and attitudes toward nursing.

The specific aims of this survey were: (1) to describe student bodies of each of the five schools of nursing in Memphis in terms of the variable clusters; (2) to compare the composite profiles of the schools, based on the data outlined above, to determine whether there are significant differences between or among the student bodies on the variables measured; (3) to determine from these data and a longitudinal follow-up whether it is possible to establish or identify predictors which may facilitate the counseling of entering nursing students into the appropriate categorical program.

Results indicate little significant difference among nursing students of the three levels at the beginning of their programs, during the course of their programs or at graduation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
INTRODUCTION	1
METHODOLOGY	2
RESULTS	4
Biographical Data	6
Personality-Value Studies	11
Perception/Reactions to Others and the Environment	19
Cognitive Structure/Adjustment	23
Attitudes Toward Nursing	27
CONCLUSIONS	27
APPENDICES	
A. Summary Description of the Data Collection Instruments	34
B. Biographical Data Questionnaire	36
C. Explanation of P.O.I. and 16 P.F. categories	41
D. Semantic Scales Used to Measure Attitudes Toward Nursing	44

COMPARISON OF STUDENTS IN THREE DIFFERENT LEVELS OF NURSING EDUCATION ON BIOGRAPHICAL, COGNITIVE STRUCTURE, PERCEPTION OF ENVIRONMENT, PERSONALITY-VALUE STRUCTURE AND ATTITUDES TOWARD NURSING

INTRODUCTION

In 1974 the five nursing education programs in Memphis implemented a cooperative consortium project with a major aim of developing a nursing core curriculum to be utilized by all the schools. It became apparent almost immediately that additional information concerning students in each of the schools was needed in order to determine additional needs and desirable outcomes of this undertaking. This core curriculum was not only to be used to identify basic content but also to help promote educational flexibility and horizontal and vertical educational progression of students between or among the schools. This innovation was to be based upon recognition of the prior learning of a student in any program and placement of that student in an appropriate transfer status and level in any of the other four programs. It was, therefore, essential to obtain accurate, comparable data from students in all schools on their educational background and other characteristics with potential for affecting their educational and future professional achievement.

Since the core curriculum was to be utilized by each of the schools in presenting to their students the basic content and processes deemed essential for R.N. licensure, it became mandatory to have an accurate picture of the type of students who would be involved in the programs of each of the consortium schools. Such knowledge was needed to provide guidance in assuring the appropriateness of this curriculum for all of the consortium students and, also, the appropriateness of the transfer arrangements proposed by the project.

Three major factors provided rationale for the needs of this descriptive profiling study. First, if students enrolling in a certain school or certain schools within the consortium exhibited markedly different characteristics in areas affecting their learning capabilities or nursing practice potential, such differences might dictate the need for different approaches to teaching or instruction of those students if recognition of their placement was to be granted by the other schools. Second, any obvious differences among student compositions which might cause doubt of the potential of any students for baccalaureate study would indicate that transfer arrangements different from those originally contemplated might be necessary. Lastly, it was hoped that student profile information, comparable for all nursing students in the city and followed up longitudinally over a period of time, might provide the means of identifying predictors of those students most likely to pursue the baccalaureate degree after entering the profession by means other than baccalaureate types of programs. Identification of such students early

in their postgraduate school careers would make possible more effective counseling and would, thus, contribute to the efficiency and economy of their educational paths.

A survey of the five consortium schools indicated that each collected certain types of information on its entering students. However, the data collected differed from school to school, and the available summaries and composites of entering student data were also different from school to school. The information collected variously by the schools was largely composed in whole or part of high school or college G.P.A., A.C.T. scores, general biographical information, I.Q. test scores and scores from other types of psychological or personality measures.

Because of the variety of information collected by the different schools and because of the variations in their methods of reporting and summarizing the information that was collected, it was impossible to compile comparable information for all schools, hence, to compare across all schools. The problem was, then, to survey the students of all schools in the consortium to establish similarities and differences across the students within each school and across the student bodies of the five different schools. The purpose of the particular data collection, outlined in this report, was to survey students entering the consortium schools in 1974 and 1975, on designated variables, to establish composite profiles of the students within each of the five schools on these variables and to compare the students across the five schools on these variables.

METHODOLOGY

All students entering the five consortium schools in 1974 and 1975 were orally informed during class or assembly sessions of the intent of the data collection and asked to cooperate by responding to a packet of instruments which would be provided.

Data were collected under five broad category headings by means of the instruments indicated:

Category	Designation	Instruments*
1	Personality-Value Structure	Personal Orientation Inventory (P.O.I.) 16 P.F. Study of Values

*Additional information on the Instruments for Categories I-V is found in the Appendices.

Category	Designation	Instrument*
II	Attitudes Toward Nursing	Nursing Checklist CTN Scale Semantic Scale (Introduced in 1975. Not used in 1974.)
III	Perception/Reaction to Others and Environment	Cynicism Scale Humanitarianism Scale Social Reaction Inventory
IV	Cognitive Structure/ Adjustment	Rokeach Dogmatism Scale JIM Motivation Scale Minnesota Survey of Opinion
V	Biographical	Biographical Questionnaire

All instruments are paper-pencil response instruments, and directions for each instrument were given in writing along with the instrument. More information about each instrument is given in Appendix A.

All students were asked to respond to the biographical questionnaire, but for data collection purposes in the other categories--I, II, III and IV--all entering students in each school were randomly divided into three response groups and students were randomly assigned to respond to only one of the three instruments in each of those categories. The same procedures were followed for category II, except that students were randomly assigned to take one of the two instruments used in 1974. In 1975, when three instruments were used in this category, students were randomly assigned to take one of the three instruments in category II. The random assignments were so arranged that approximately the same number of students in each school were assigned to respond to each of the instruments in a category. Variations in numbers of actual responses occurred due to differing patterns of responses and completion of data packets by students within the five schools.

After responses were returned, all answer sheets were scored, and appropriate statistical analyses applied to describe the distribution profile within each school and to compare the composite data across schools.

As originally contemplated, data collections from students were scheduled at the beginning of their nursing programs, at the beginning of each successive year of their nursing programs, at the end of their programs

*Additional information on the Instruments for Categories I-V is found in the Appendices.

and, hopefully, some months or years after graduation on a follow-up basis. However, the directors of the programs in nursing (D.O.P.I.N.) voted to discontinue the study in the late summer of 1976. Therefore, the total batteries of data are available only for those students entering in 1974 and 1975. No class has been completely followed through the entire course of its nursing education program.

RESULTS

Response

After explanations by the project director or other staff member, concerning the purposes of the data collection, descriptions of the types of information collected by each instrument and the overall format of the data collection, students were given a data collection packet containing their five assigned instruments (the biographical questionnaire and one instrument from each of the other four categories). The students were asked to carefully read the instructions for each of the data collection instruments and to answer all questions on appropriate answer sheets which were also enclosed in the packet.

In three of the schools--the three diploma programs--for both the 1974 and 1975 data collections it was possible to arrange for all affected students to respond to the instruments immediately after the explanations and the distribution of the instruments. These students responded to the data collection instruments in a session between two and three hours in length. In the two university related programs--Memphis State University Department of Nursing and the University of Tennessee, Memphis, College of Nursing--the data collection packets were distributed immediately after explanations and students were asked to take these packets with them and respond to the data collection instruments, therein, at their convenience but following the instructions given for each instrument. They were asked to complete their responses within a week after the original distribution, and a date approximately a week after distribution was set as the deadline for return of these packets.

This latter approach was necessitated by the fact that because of university scheduling, it was virtually impossible to arrange a two to three hour block of time for these students during the school day as was possible within the diploma schools. As a result, returns from the two university related programs were poorer than were returns from the diploma programs. The returns from Memphis State, especially, were so poor as to leave open to question the possible presence of bias in response patterns obtained there. Return ratios for each of the years for the entering students responding to the data collection instruments are shown in Table I, p. 5.

TABLE I

PACKETS OF DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS DISTRIBUTED TO AND RETURNED BY THE STUDENTS ENTERING THE CONSORTIUM SCHOOLS IN 1974 and 1975

School	Program Type	Packets of Instruments Distributed		Packets of Instruments Returned Completed		Percent of Returns	
		1974	1975	1974	1975	1974	1975
Baptist	Diploma	158	131	151	119	96	91
Methodist	Diploma	140	151	136	147	97	97
St. Joseph	Diploma	54	66	53	58	98	88
Memphis State	A.D.	132	132	89	63	67	48
University of Tennessee	Baccalaureate	71	76	54	57	76	75

It should be pointed out that only results from the data collected from entering students from 1974 and 1975 are reported in this summary. Some data were also collected from second and third level students in each of the data collection years. The original plan had been to follow a student throughout the course of her involvement within a particular educational program, collecting the full battery of data at the beginning of the program and the full battery, except for the biographical questionnaire, at the end of the program and surveying various components of the four categories of data collection, other than biographical, during the course of the student's educational career. Although this approach was begun, it was never completed because of the decision made by the directors of the programs in nursing (D.O.P.I.N.) in 1976 to discontinue the data collection activities. Because of its incompleteness, data from less than the full batteries are not reported herein.

Biographical Data

The data discussed in this section and summarized in Tables II, III and IV, pp. 7 - 9 of this report are from the 1974 data collection, only. The combination of computer crash and clerical error caused the loss of 1975 biographical data scored within the computer and left 1975 biographical summaries incomplete. Where adequate data from 1975 for comparisons were left, the trends or patterns of data were very similar to the same trends or patterns for the 1974 data. It is believed that these 1974 data, then, are fairly characteristic of the biographical response patterns. The biographical data from the 1974 collection were presented, summarized and analyzed in more detail in an addendum of the project's 1976 annual report.

The biographical data collected were comprehensive, including personal, family, demographic, educational information and materials concerning interests and attitudes toward nursing. Because of space and time constraints only selected categories of information from the 1974 biographical data are presented in this addendum summary. This information is found in Tables II, III and IV, pp. 7-9.

The composition of student bodies of the five schools in 1974 was strikingly similar. Two of the schools--Baptist and the University of Tennessee-had no males in the entering classes surveyed. Baptist maintains a policy which does not permit admission of men. Methodist's class was only 2% male while the St. Joseph and Memphis State classes contained 8% and 9% males, respectively.

The percent of black students in each school's entering class ranged from 6% at Baptist to 17% at St. Joseph's.

The mean age of entering students ranged from 18.09 at Baptist to 24.69 at Memphis State. The shorter program and more liberal student policies

TABLE II

SELECTED BIOGRAPHICAL DATA OF ENTERING STUDENTS
IN THE FIVE CONSORTIUM SCHOOLS

Variable	Schools				
	Baptist	Methodist	St. Joseph	Memphis State	Univ. of Tenn.
Sex					
%Male	0	2	9	8	0
%Female	100	98	91	92	100
Race					
%Caucasian	93	88	83	90	87
%Black	6	9.5	17	9	13
%Oriental		1			
Age					
Mean	18.09	19.68	21.77	24.69	20.85
Median	17.94	18.58	20.2	21.57	19.77
Standard Deviation	1.15	3.87	4.93	8.40	4.11
Range	16-24	16-49	17-43	16-55	18-39
Marital Status					
%Single	100	81	60	52	87
%Divorced	0	3	2	8	2
%Widowed	0	0	2	1	0
%Married	0	16	36	38	11
Place of Birth					
%Memphis	24	42	42	51	39
%Rest of Tennessee	11	9	8	15	26
%Mississippi	10	11	9	4	5
%Arkansas	7	6	4	0	2
%Rest of Southeast	21	14	20	17	9
%Northeast	15	10	11	3	17
%Other	12	7	6	10	2
Residence Just Before Entering Nursing Program					
%Memphis-Shelby Co.	38	69	73	91	53
%City of 100,000+	10	4	2	3	6
%City size-30-100,000	6	4	6	2	4
%Town-10-30,000	13	6	6	0	7
%Town less than 10,000	17	9	6	1	17
%Rural	16	8	8	2	13
Family's Annual Income					
%Less than $5000	3	8	8	10	4
%$5-10,000	25	19	26	15	20
%$10-20,000	48	36	40	39	42
%$20-35,000	10	14	13	17	26
%$35-50,000	4	4	4	7	6
%No Answer	10	18	9	12	2

TABLE III

TYPICAL RESPONSES TO THE QUESTION "WHY DID YOU DECIDE TO ENTER NURSING?" AND THE PERCENT OF STUDENTS IN EACH SCHOOL GIVING EACH RESPONSE

Response	Schools				
	Baptist	Methodist	St. Joseph	Memphis State	Univ. of Tennessee
To help people	60	46	47	30	59
Nursing is exciting/challenging/rewarding	9	13	23	4	9
Interested in Medicine	11	11	11	12	7
Nursing provides excellent opportunities and means of support	17	18	9	31	15
Enjoy this type of work	5	4	9	7	7
Previously worked in the health field	7	11	8	11	15
Lord is leading me to be a nurse	11		4	1	4
World needs more good nurses	1	1.5	4	2	2
Provides a means to make something of my life	3	10	2	9	

TABLE IV

TYPICAL RESPONSES TO THE QUESTION "WHY DID YOU CHOOSE YOUR PARTICULAR SCHOOL?" AND THE PERCENT OF STUDENTS IN EACH SCHOOL GIVING EACH RESPONSE

Reason for selecting your school	Schools				
	Baptist	Methodist	St. Joseph	Memphis State	Univ. of Tenn.
Recommended highly; excellent reputation; best instruction	14	18.5	40		13
Friendly, encouraging staff; focus on individual	3	7	19		
School had opening for fall after I applied/ I had been accepted earlier	2	7	9	3	
Supportive atmosphere			8		
Worked in associated hospital		1	8		
Summer off			4		
Like sectarian school			2		
Could afford this school	5			3	2
Program more flexible, easier for married person with children		1.5		2	
Wanted B.S.					18
Location	2	1		2	2

at Memphis State appear to attract more mature students. It is interesting to note that the mean ages of students at both St. Joseph's and Memphis State are slightly higher than the mean age of entering students at the University of Tennessee although the latter program has general education prerequisites requiring at least one year of college work before admission to the program, and St. Joseph's and Memphis State do not have similar requirements.

The data collected indicated that a large proportion of students in all of the schools were born in Tennessee and/or had resided in the state before entrance into their programs. This proportion was a majority one for both the above variables in all schools except Baptist. The percent of students who had been born in Tennessee ranged from 35% of the Baptist student body to 66% of the Memphis State student body. The proportion of students born outside the Southeastern region was relatively small in all the schools, ranging from 13% among Memphis State students to 27% among the Baptist students.

In all schools except Baptist where the percent was 38, the percent of students who resided in Memphis-Shelby County prior to entrance in the nursing education programs constituted more than half of each class, ranging from 53% at the University of Tennessee to 91% at Memphis State. More students from rural and small town areas were represented in the Baptist (33%) and University of Tennessee (30%) student bodies than in those of the other schools.

The family income level of students is rather similar across schools with only 3-10% of the student bodies coming from families with less than $5000 annual income; 13-25% coming from families with annual incomes of $5000-$10,000; 36-48% from families with annual incomes between $10,000 and $20,000; and 14-32% from families with annual incomes above $20,000.

While some variations exist in reasons students have for entering nursing, the similarities of reasons are, again, striking. The reason most often given was "to help people." Thirty percent of the Memphis State students gave this answer-the minimum proportion in any school. Largest proportions giving this response were 59% and 60% at the University of Tennessee and Baptist, respectively. Other frequently cited responses are found in Table III, p. 8.

Reasons given for selecting their particular school varied greatly from one individual to another and also across schools although the reasons most often given had to do with the excellent recommendations, high quality, reputation, etc. Reasons given and percent citing particular reasons are given in Table IV, p. 9.

In general, variation in hard data such as age, income, etc. was relatively small across schools while variance increased in responses to rationale, opinion and attitude questions.

The questionnaire form used for data collection is found in Appendix B.

Personality-Value Studies

Data for 1974 and 1975 from the three instruments used for data collection in this category--the Personal Orientation Inventory, the 16 P.F. test and the Study of Values--are found in Tables V, VI and VII, pp. 12-17. Since these are copyrighted instruments, copies of these instruments are not included in the Appendices.

On the Personal Orientation Inventory (P.O.I.), there were no significant differences across the five schools on any of the fourteen factors measured in the 1974 data collection. The only factor on which the F ratio across schools approached significance for the 1974 data was for the Time incompetence factor, and the significance level for that factor lay above the 0.10 level. Each individual school's profile and the overall composites on all factors for the 1974 data lay just slightly below the 50th percentile of the adult norms and were similar to, though slightly higher than, the student nurses' norms reported in the P.O.I. test manual (p. 11). The mean Time and Support Ratios for the 1974 data were 1:2.56 and 1:1.74, respectively. These lay in the non-self actualized range, slightly below the "normal" range.

Results from the 1975 data differ in many respects from the 1974 data. F ratio obtained from comparison across the five schools increased on nine of the variable factors measured, and there was significant difference at the 0.05 level or beyond on five of the factors: other directedness; existentiality; self regard; self acceptance; and nature of man, constructive. It can be noted that a larger variability occurs in mean scores for other directedness across the schools, largely due to a rather large shift downward in the mean score of one of the schools, St. Joseph's.

Shifts upward in the mean scores of St. Joseph's and Memphis State helped to increase the range of variability of the scores for existentiality, thus contributing to the significance of difference across scores in this category. Although shifts in these and other categories are adequate enough to cause a significant difference in the comparison across schools, it should be noted that the mean scores for most of the factors shifted relatively little from year to year in a particular school. The mean Time and Support Ratios across schools in 1975 were 1:2.84 and 1:1.91, respectively. These are quite close to the ratios obtained in 1974 and place students in the same general position on the non-self actualized-self actualized continuum.

TABLE V

SUMMARY STATISTICS FOR RESPONSES OF EACH SCHOOL GROUP ON THE SCALE OF THE PERSONAL ORIENTATION INVENTORY IN 1974 AND 1975

Factor	Year	SCHOOLS										
		Baptist		Methodist		St. Joseph		Memphis State		Univ. of Tenn.		
		$\bar{X}$	S.D.	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	F Ratio
T_i	1974	7.22	2.74	6.29	3.01	6.00	2.32	7.30	2.49	5.53	2.60	1.96
	1975	6.59	2.42	5.86	2.77	6.26	2.45	5.00	2.07	5.79	2.21	1.54
T_c	1974	15.78	2.76	16.66	3.06	16.88	2.32	15.43	2.48	16.76	4.52	1.17
	1975	16.30	2.37	16.86	2.96	16.42	2.52	17.62	2.06	16.64	2.12	1.03
O	1974	46.62	11.08	44.84	15.06	45.12	9.37	47.04	8.65	44.35	14.53	0.24
	1975	46.59	7.71	45.20	9.74	39.89	8.03	42.52	9.06	41.43	9.46	2.54**
I	1974	79.40	9.60	78.37	8.93	81.06	10.70	78.78	7.48	79.71	10.85	0.27
	1975	80.52	7.88	80.86	9.49	86.16	8.72	83.10	8.28	81.93	5.93	1.72
SAV	1974	19.42	4.34	20.08	2.60	19.06	3.80	20.13	2.38	18.76	4.93	0.62
	1975	19.91	2.71	20.08	2.76	20.95	2.44	20.81	1.94	19.14	1.96	1.44
Ex	1974	16.51	5.03	16.68	3.77	17.94	4.64	16.57	3.74	16.94	4.28	0.37
	1975	17.50	3.31	16.37	4.00	19.84	4.80	18.67	4.08	17.86	3.16	2.49**
Fr	1974	14.04	3.75	14.76	2.77	15.06	2.62	14.00	2.89	14.06	3.53	0.53
	1975	15.36	2.87	14.96	2.29	15.42	3.00	15.48	2.40	15.64	1.95	0.31
S	1974	10.98	2.13	11.50	2.08	11.76	2.22	11.65	2.40	10.53	3.10	1.15
	1975	11.93	2.11	12.37	2.24	12.32	1.78	11.17	2.19	12.07	1.28	0.50

**p(4,147)>.05, <.01

TABLE V
(continued)

Factor	Year	Baptist		Methodist		St. Joseph		Memphis State		Univ. of [illegible]		
		$\bar{X}$	S.D.	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	F. Ratio
Sr	1974	12.29	1.49	12.71	2.57	13.00	2.57	12.04	1.89	11.59	3.47	1.14
	1975	12.20	2.10	13.69	1.59	13.37	1.98	12.43	2.36	12.57	1.64	4.06***
Sa	1974	12.80	4.42	13.84	2.75	14.88	3.18	14.25	2.63	13.82	3.38	1.41
	1975	14.09	2.70	13.96	3.17	16.00	3.11	15.67	3.09	15.14	3.00	2.59**
Nc	1974	11.47	2.46	11.66	1.76	11.35	1.27	12.22	1.57	11.82	1.85	0.71
	1975	10.86	2.26	12.37	2.16	11.63	1.78	12.38	1.43	11.29	1.83	3.80***
Sy	1974	7.42	2.98	6.58	1.06	6.94	1.14	6.83	1.11	6.88	1.32	1.04
	1975	6.66	1.22	7.02	2.29	6.74	1.52	7.38	1.13	6.57	1.29	0.86
A	1974	15.69	3.04	15.03	2.48	15.71	3.37	15.48	2.81	15.00	2.96	0.40
	1975	16.09	2.48	15.08	3.70	16.68	3.42	15.67	2.38	16.79	2.45	1.50
C	1974	16.58	2.98	16.29	3.97	17.88	3.08	16.35	3.05	17.12	4.04	0.78
	1975	17.39	2.81	17.06	4.08	18.58	2.91	18.05	3.18	18.64	2.64	1.16
N	1974	45		38		15		23		17		
	1975	44		49		19		21		14		

**p(4,147) >.05, >.01
***p(4,147) <.01

TABLE VI

SUMMARY STATISTICS FOR RESPONSES OF EACH SCHOOL GROUP ON THE FACTORS OF THE 16 PERSONALITY FACTORS TEST IN 1974 AND 1975

Factor	Statistic	SCHOOLS: Baptist 1974	Baptist 1975	Methodist 1974	Methodist 1975	St. Joseph 1974	St. Joseph 1975	Memphis State 1974	Memphis State 1975	Univ. of Tenn. 1974	Univ. of Tenn. 1975	F Ratio 1974	F Ratio 1975
A	$\bar{X}$	10.70	11.08	10.30	10.56	9.57	11.05	10.04	10.42	10.25	11.75		
	S.D.	2.48	2.28	2.56	2.69	2.82	3.14	2.58	2.83	4.17	3.23		
	Sten	5	5	5	5	4	5	4	4	4	5	0.53	0.71
B	$\bar{X}$	7.17	8.73	8.70	8.70	8.14	8.40	8.33	9.12	9.06	9.00		
	S.D.	1.81	2.15	2.47	1.42	1.99	2.50	1.71	1.41	1.73	1.70		
	Sten	4	6	5	6	5	5	5	6	6	6	3.43**	0.40
C	$\bar{X}$	14.53	16.57	15.87	16.88	16.93	14.65	14.13	17.00	16.38	17.38		
	S.D.	4.10	3.11	2.87	3.56	2.30	4.30	3.97	3.93	4.60	3.13		
	Sten	5	6	6	6	6	5	5	6	6	6	2.25*	1.73
E	$\bar{X}$	10.51	10.54	11.87	11.05	12.21	11.20	10.88	12.00	11.00	13.31		
	S.D.	3.43	3.57	4.04	3.98	2.42	3.61	4.04	4.27	4.52	3.90		
	Sten	5	5	6	6	6	5	6	6	5	7	1.73	1.58
F	$\bar{X}$	15.19	15.35	14.90	16.09	17.00	16.25	13.96	16.24	14.06	16.44		
	S.D.	3.95	4.09	3.71	3.73	4.85	3.85	4.50	3.87	5.30	4.64		
	Sten	5	5	5	6	6	6	4	6	4	6	1.33	0.32

*p(4,126) <.10, >.05
**p(4,126) <.05, >.01

TABLE VI
(continued)

Factor	Statistic	SCHOOLS: Baptist 1974	Baptist 1975	Methodist 1974	Methodist 1975	St. Joseph 1974	St. Joseph 1975	Memphis State 1974	Memphis State 1975	Univ. of Tenn. 1974	Univ. of Tenn. 1975	F Ratio 1974	F Ratio 1975
G	$\bar{X}$	13.45	13.95	14.63	14.60	14.64	13.05	13.58	14.06	14.56	13.69		
	S.D.	2.47	3.25	3.22	3.19	3.48	2.65	2.84	2.69	2.83	2.20		
	Sten	6	7	7	7	7	6	7	7	7	7	1.25	0.99
H	$\bar{X}$	12.98	12.76	14.33	13.98	14.86	14.85	14.83	15.71	13.06	15.50		
	S.D.	4.27	5.63	6.60	5.73	5.88	5.56	4.98	6.17	6.41	4.32		
	Sten	5	5	6	6	6	6	6	6	5	6	0.76	1.18
I	$\bar{X}$	13.00	12.84	14.37	13.56	13.57	12.75	14.58	13.35	13.50	15.19		
	S.D.	2.98	3.37	3.54	2.94	2.10	1.87	2.84	2.83	3.01	2.87		
	Sten	5	5	6	6	6	5	6	5	6	6	1.53	2.05*[b]
L	$\bar{X}$	8.13	7.54	7.50	6.84	6.36	6.90	7.75	7.29	7.39	6.50		
	S.D.	2.73	3.14	2.99	2.74	2.76	3.21	3.69	3.34	3.88	2.62		
	Sten	6	6	6	6	5	6	6	6	6	6	0.89	0.46
M	$\bar{X}$	10.32	11.00	12.23	10.81	11.93	10.25	12.67	12.00	11.50	11.94		
	S.D.	3.45	2.31	2.94	3.69	3.17	3.75	3.05	3.51	3.81	3.07		
	Sten	5	5	5	5	5	5	6	5	5	5	2.00*[a]	0.97
N	$\bar{X}$	9.53	10.32	9.40	9.53	9.29	10.00	8.58	8.88	9.31	10.06		
	S.D.	2.80	2.36	3.06	3.29	2.20	2.07	2.57	2.89	2.82	2.75		
	Sten	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	0.49	0.92
O	$\bar{X}$	11.77	11.30	10.30	9.35	10.00	10.35	11.08	10.41	11.31	9.19		
	S.D.	3.25	4.01	2.39	4.26	3.31	3.76	3.49	4.02	5.25	3.60		
	Sten	6	6	5	5	5	5	6	5	6	5	1.22	1.39

*[a] $p(4,126) < .10, > .05$
*[b] $p(4,133) < .10, > .05$

TABLE VI
(continued)

Factor	Statistic	SCHOOLS											
		Baptist		Methodist		St. Joseph		Memphis State		Univ. of Tenn.		F Ratio	
		1974	1975	1974	1975	1974	1975	1974	1975	1974	1975	1974	1975
Q_1	$\bar{X}$	7.06	6.51	8.37	6.81	8.29	7.70	7.29	7.00	7.13	7.50		
	S.D.	3.17	2.71	4.32	3.11	2.49	2.65	2.88	3.34	2.33	2.60		
	Sten	5	5	6	5	6	6	5	5	5	6	0.95	0.68
Q_2	$\bar{X}$	10.30	10.05	10.37	8.63	10.71	9.20	10.21	9.94	10.13	9.50		
	S.D.	2.84	2.92	3.09	3.85	4.01	2.18	3.35	3.98	3.98	3.61		
	Sten	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	0.07	0.99
Q_3	$\bar{X}$	12.53	12.84	13.87	13.81	13.29	12.00	12.54	13.35	14.38	13.19		
	S.D.	2.77	3.14	2.66	2.76	3.02	2.86	3.36	3.36	2.78	2.30		
	Sten	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	2.00*	1.40
Q_4	$\bar{X}$	13.94	12.11	12.40	12.44	13.29	13.30	13.92	13.76	14.00	13.44		
	S.D.	4.33	3.67	3.94	4.75	3.15	4.67	3.61	5.56	5.75	4.74		
	Sten	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	0.75	0.58
	N	47	37	38	43	14	20	23	17	17	16		

*p(4,126) <.10, >.05

TABLE VII

SUMMARY STATISTICS FOR RESPONSES OF EACH SCHOOL GROUP TO EACH VALUE SYSTEM OF THE STUDY OF VALUES IN 1974 AND 1975

Value System	Year	Baptist		Methodist		SCHOOLS: St. Joseph		Memphis State		Univ. of Tenn.		F Ratio
		$\bar{X}$	S.D.	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	
Theoretical	1974	37.44	5.75	38.51	7.15	37.54	4.82	39.92	5.09	36.60	6.34	0.69
	1975	35.92	6.43	37.96	5.87	39.72	6.38	42.36	5.56	37.63	7.55	3.79***
Economic	1974	35.96	5.27	36.71	6.59	37.23	6.43	34.69	5.72	37.20	7.83	0.45
	1975	36.00	6.50	37.80	6.28	35.61	6.50	36.15	6.01	35.37	6.69	0.84
Aesthetic	1974	37.56	5.64	39.22	7.66	39.46	6.53	41.00	6.26	36.27	7.01	1.29
	1975	38.19	7.93	38.00	6.98	36.94	6.31	42.59	8.16	43.95	7.97	3.78***
Social	1974	44.44	6.31	43.56	5.97	42.92	6.22	43.69	8.39	44.93	6.34	0.28
	1975	45.33	7.13	44.02	5.55	46.94	6.61	42.59	7.43	41.16	6.30	2.37*[b]
Political	1974	35.67	5.86	38.12	6.55	36.69	6.54	34.85	7.17	38.13	7.89	1.20
	1975	35.19	5.32	36.51	6.49	34.44	4.76	36.05	4.35	37.00	4.21	0.80
Religious	1974	48.69	6.17	43.90	8.77	46.15	8.88	45.85	8.38	47.73	7.27	2.19*[a]
	1975	48.92	8.87	45.90	9.81	46.17	7.13	38.82	11.30	44.63	7.20	4.06***
N	1974	45		41		13		13		15		
	1975	36		49		18		22		19		

*[a] $p(4,122) < .10, > .05$

*[b] $p(4,144) < .10, > .05$

*** $p(4,144) < .01$

On the 16 P.F. responses, there are great similarities of responses across years. It can be noted that in the 1974 collection, differences across schools were significant beyond the 0.05 level on only one factor, Factor B, which deals with intelligence. Results on three other factors, Factor C, dealing with emotional stability; Factor M, dealing with practicality vs. imaginativeness and Factor Q_3 dealing with self discipline-self centeredness yielded F ratios with significance between the 0.05 and the 0.10 level. No significant differences at or beyond the 0.05 level occurred in the 1975 results, and only one difference significant in the 0.05 to 0.10 range was noted. That was for Factor I, dealing with sensitivity vs. realism.

Overall means across schools on each factor for both years tended to be near the middle of the sten score continuum reported in the test handbook but consistently toward the higher score regions of the middle ranges indicating moderate possession of the upper score range description characteristics.

Results across the schools on the six value systems measured by the Study of Values differed somewhat markedly in certain respects from 1974 to 1975. For the 1974 data only one value system differed across schools with an F ratio approaching significance. This difference lay in the range of the 0.05 to 0.10 level; the system involved was the religious system. On that system the value system mean score for Baptist's students was high; those for Methodist's and Memphis State's students were low with the mean scores for students at St.Joseph's and the University of Tennessee lying in between. On the 1975 data the across school comparison yielded three value systems for which F ratios were significant beyond the 0.01 level, and another for which the level of significance lay in the range of 0.05 to 0.10.

The religious, theoretical and social value systems yielded a difference which was significant beyond the 0.01 level. Again, as with the 1974 data on the religious value system, the mean score of Baptist's students was high; that for Memphis State students was low and the other three schools lay in between. On the theoretical value system the mean score for students at Memphis State was high; that for students at Baptist was low with that for students of the other three schools in between. On the social value system two of the schools, Memphis State and the University of Tennessee, had relatively low mean scores; two, Baptist and St. Joseph had relatively high, with Methodist students lying approximately midway between the extremes.

Overall, the mean value systems across schools for both years gave results similar to the female college norms for the same instrument. For the economic value systems school means and female college norms were congruent. On the theoretical, social and religious value systems the mean school scores were slightly higher than the female college norms. On the political

and esthetic systems mean school scores were, on the whole, slightly lower than those same norms for female college students.

Perception/Reaction to Others and Environment

Data from the three instruments--Cynicism Scale, Humanitarianism Scale and Social Reaction Inventory--used to measure students' perception/reaction to others and the environment, are found in Tables VIII, IX and X, pp. 20-22. It is interesting to note that significance levels on the 1974 and 1975 returns from the Cynicism and Humanitarianism scale are almost exactly opposite. On the 1974 results the differences across schools on the Cynicism Scale approached significance, lying in the range of 0.05 to 0.10. The 1975 across schools comparison for the Cynicism Scale showed no significant differences across schools. On the 1974 results the mean score for students at Baptist was high; that for students at the University of Tennessee College of Nursing was low with that of students at Methodist also relatively low and mean scores for students at St. Joseph's and Memphis State lying in between. In 1975 students at St. Joseph's have the highest mean score; those at Memphis State the lowest mean scores with the students from the other three schools clustering midway between. It should be noted that on this scale higher scores indicate greater cynicism. The midpoint of possible scores is 144, and the highest mean score achieved by any school in either year was 118.96, the mean score for students at Baptist on the 1974 results.

Scores on the Humanitarianism Scale did not yield a significant difference across schools in 1974, but the F ratio across schools for 1975 did approach significance lying in the range of 0.05 to 0.10. The highest score on the 1974 Humanitarianism Scale results was achieved by Memphis State students, and the lowest score by Methodist students but with very little difference, a range of only about six points separating all five schools. In 1975 the highest mean score was that for Baptist students with the lowest mean score that for Memphis State students and the range separating the two was approximately eleven points. Again, as with the Cynicism Scale, the higher the score on this instrument the greater the humanitarianism indicated. With a midpoint of possible scores of 112 on this instrument, the mean scores range across the two years from a low of approximately 155 to a high of approximately 166.

Scores on the Social Reaction Inventory are compiled to indicate a mean internal locus of control score and a mean external locus of control score for each school. These two mean scores are then compared to obtain an external to internal ratio of control. The lower the decimal yielded by this ratio, the greater the prevalence and importance of internal motivation. The 1974 results yielded external to internal ratios ranging from 1:1.52 for students at Baptist to 1:2.26 for students at the University of Tennessee College of Nursing.

TABLE VIII

SUMMARY STATISTICS FOR RESPONSES OF EACH SCHOOL GROUP TO THE CYNICISM[a] SCALE IN 1974 AND 1975

	Year	Baptist	Methodist	SCHOOLS St. Joseph	Memphis State	Univ. of Tenn.	F Ratio
N	1974	53	47	17	20	20	
	1975	42	50	21	21	18	
$\bar{X}$	1974	118.96	103.13	111.65	111.50	100.60	
	1975	103.86	103.96	118.05	92.48	100.67	
S.D.	1974	28.89	27.74	36.31	33.17	32.01	
	1975	34.73	29.37	28.60	52.76	41.27	
Range	1974	66-207	52-168	41-161	42-163	50-176	
	1975	40-174	39-180	67-165	36-161	42-161	
	1974						2.26*
	1975						1.36

*P(4,152) <.10, >.05

[a]Minimum Possible Score - 36
Maximum Possible Score - 252
Mid Point - 144
Higher Score - Greater Cynicism

TABLE IX

SUMMARY STATISTICS FOR RESPONSES OF EACH SCHOOL GROUP TO THE HUMANITARIANISM SCALE[b] IN 1975 AND 1975

		SCHOOLS					F
	Year	Baptist	Methodist	St. Joseph	Memphis State	Univ. of Tenn.	Ratio
N	1974	49	44	18	20	17	
	1975	38	48	19	22	17	
$\bar{X}$	1974	160.73	158.27	162.72	164.50	158.76	
	1975	165.61	163.35	161.11	154.64	161.24	
S.D.	1974	16.07	11.48	8.98	17.75	15.49	
	1975	15.40	13.14	17.11	17.04	10.02	
Range	1974	131-191	142-186	147-179	120-183	128-188	
	1975	135-188	124-188	135-188	118-185	146-178	
	1974						0.83
	1975						2.09*

*p(4.144) <.10, >.05

[b]Minimum Possible Score - 28
Maximum Possible Score - 196
Mid Point - 112
Higher Score - Greater Humanitarianism

TABLE X

SUMMARY STATISTICS FOR RESPONSES OF EACH SCHOOL GROUP
TO THE SOCIAL REACTION INVENTORY
IN 1974 AND 1975

	SCHOOLS									
	Baptist		Methodist		St. Joseph		Memphis State Univ.		of Tenn.	
	1974	1975	1974	1975	1974	1975	1974	1975	1974	1975
N	49	38	46	49	18	18	26	20	17	21
$\bar{X}$, Internal	17.49	19.55	17.80	18.90	19.17	19.67	19.00	18.90	20.12	18.33
$\bar{X}$, External	11.51	9.45	11.20	10.10	9.83	9.33	10.00	10.10	8.88	10.67
E/I Ratio	1:1.52	1:207	1:1.59	1:1.87	1:1.95	1:2.11	1:1.90	1:1.87	1:2.26	1:1.72

These results indicated that in 1974 all students operated on internal motivation more than they operated on external motivation, with internal motivation operating one and one half to a little more than twice as frequently as external motivation.

Results for 1975 were similar with the range of ratios being from 1:1.72 for students at the University of Tennessee College of Nursing to 1:2.11 for students at St. Joseph's. There were slight shifts in 1975 toward more internal motivation among students at Baptist, Methodist and St. Joseph's. Memphis State students' ratio was almost the same; internal motivation decreased among University of Tennessee students, based on results of the data collection instrument.

Cognitive Structure/Adjustment

Summaries of the data collected by the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale, the JIM Motivation Scale and the short form of the Minnesota Survey of Opinion--measures of cognitive structure and adjustment--are found in Tables XI, XII and XIII on pp. 24-26.

On the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale, no significant differences across the schools were indicated, based on the 1974 data. Differences across schools for 1975 were not within the range usually considered significant although they did approach significance, lying in the 0.05 to 0.10 range. Results for students across the two years were surprisingly similar for students from Baptist, St. Joseph's and Memphis State. However, results across the years for students at Methodist and the University of Tennessee College of Nursing differed with students from each of those schools scoring higher in the second year by six to almost eight points. On this particular instrument, either very high or very low scores indicate a high degree of dogmatism while scores lying in the middle part of the range indicate open-mindedness. The exact midpoint possible on the scoring scale is 160. On both years mean scores for the schools involved lay well within this middle range with the lowest score for either of the two years being 150.84 and the highest 165.61.

Results across schools on the JIM Motivation Scale failed to yield significance at the 0.05 level for either year. For both years results approached significance, lying within the 0.05 to 0.10 range. For this particular instrument higher scores indicate higher motivation with the midpoint of possible scores equaling 100 and the maximum possible score equaling 200. For both years results for all five schools lay well above the midpoint, ranging across the two years from a low of 130.76 to a high of 151.67.

The Minnesota Survey of Opinion (short form) failed to yield any indication of significant differences across schools, based on either the 1974

TABLE XI

SUMMARY STATISTICS FOR RESPONSES OF EACH SCHOOL GROUP
TO THE ROKEACH DOGMATISM SCALE[a]
IN 1974 AND 1975

		SCHOOLS					F
	Year	Baptist	Methodist	St. Joseph	M.S.U.	Univ. of Tenn.	Ratio
N	1974	48	46	17	16	19	
	1975	38	48	19	22	17	
$\bar{X}$	1974	164.75	155.93	162.24	154.38	150.84	
	1975	165.61	163.35	161.11	154.64	161.24	
S.D.	1974	26.24	26.24	29.48	22.23	31.04	
	1975	15.40	13.14	17.11	17.04	10.12	
Range	1974	117-229	108-209	119-205	116-192	97-199	
	1975	135-188	124-188	135-188	118-185	146-178	
	1974						1.31
	1975						2.09*

*p(4,144) <.10, >.05

[a]Minimum Possible Score - 40
Maximum Possible Score - 280
Score near either extreme-High Dogmatism
Mid Point - 160
Score near middle-Open-Mindedness

TABLE XII

SUMMARY STATISTICS FOR RESPONSES OF EACH SCHOOL GROUP TO THE JUNIOR INDEX OF MOTIVATION SCALE[a] IN 1974 AND 1975

	Year	SCHOOLS					F Ratio
		Baptist	Methodist	St. Joseph	M.S.U.	Univ. of Tenn.	
N	1974	49	48	16	21	16	
	1975	39	47	18	23	18	
$\bar{X}$	1974	130.76	142.23	136.81	142.90	144.06	
	1975	137.44	139.77	146.33	142.17	151.67	
S.D.	1974	21.22	18.85	18.14	15.91	16.14	
	1975	20.79	18.24	17.84	17.14	14.39	
Range	1974	74-166	96-175	109-170	106-162	124-172	
	1975	90-184	84-176	88-174	113-169	124-181	
	1974						3.15**
	1975						2.27*

*p(4,145) <.10, >.05
**p(4,145) <.05, >.01

[a]Minimum Possible Score - 0
Maximum Possible Score -200
Mid Point - 100
Higher Score - Higher Motivation

TABLE XIII

SUMMARY STATISTICS FOR RESPONSES OF EACH SCHOOL GROUP TO THE MINNESOTA SURVEY OF OPINION (SHORT FORM)[a] IN 1974 AND 1975

				SCHOOLS			F
	Year	Baptist	Methodist	St. Joseph	M.S.U.	Univ. of Tenn.	Ratio
N	1974	49	44	17	30	18	
	1975	41	52	20	20	18	
$\bar{X}$	1974	107.31	109.34	109.35	105.83	106.72	
	1975	101.00	108.19	107.40	107.50	107.22	
S.D.	1974	9.37	7.81	7.97	7.82	8.20	
	1975	29.32	16.93	9.54	12.02	6.93	
Range	1974	83-122	90-123	97-121	90-120	80-115	
	1975	32-122	34-127	82-122	88-136	92-121	
	1974						1.04
	1975						0.93

[a] Minimum Possible Score - 31
Maximum Possible Score - 155
Mid Point - 93
Higher Score - Better Adjustment

or the 1975 data. On this instrument higher scores indicate better adjustment. The midpoint score attainable on the scale involved is 93; the maximum possible score is 155. Comparing mean scores for all schools across the two years, it is apparent that the scores lie in the upper half of the range although they are closer to the midpoint than to the maximum possible score. Scores across the years ranged from a low of 101.00 to a high of 108.19.

Attitudes Toward Nursing

Portions of the data collected under this category heading have been extremely helpful, while other parts proved useless due to factors outlined below.

Results from the CTN Scale are not summarized because of space limitations and lack of significant difference in categories across schools.

Results on the Nursing Checklist are summarized in Table XIV, p. 28. As can be seen, there was some variation across schools in both categories of this checklist--the perceived characteristics needed for Nursing and the students' perceptions of their own characteristics. Variations across years of data collection is also apparent. On the whole there is a consistent evaluation of self characteristics as being present by a smaller percent of students than the percent indicated by students to be needed by nurses.

Semantic Profile results are summarized in Tables XV-XXII, pp. 29-32. If reference is made to the scales in Appendix D, note that for analyses in Tables XV-XXII the scales are reported in alphabetical, not occurrence, order. As can be seen from the across school F computed from analysis of variance results, there is no significant difference across the schools. Semantic results are summarized for the 1975 data only since these scales were not administered to students in 1974.

CONCLUSIONS

Results of data collection in five major categories--Biographical, Personality-Value Structure, Perception/Reaction to Others and Environment, Cognitive Structure/Adjustment and Attitudes Toward Nursing--indicate a high degree of congruence and similarity in response across all five of the schools participating in the survey. Although a few differences across schools, significant at the 0.05 level or beyond, were noted and although there were changes--some significant--across years, on the whole students in all five of the schools showed a high degree of similarity on the characteristics measured.

TABLE XIV

SUMMARY STATISTICS FOR RESPONSES OF EACH SCHOOL GROUP CONSIDERING CHARACTERISTICS COMMONLY ASSOCIATED WITH NURSING AS CORRESPONDING TO THEIR PICTURE OF NURSING (N) AND CONSIDERING THE SAME CHARACTERISTICS PERSONALLY (P) IN 1974 AND 1975

Characteristic	Baptist				Methodist				St. Joseph				Memphis State				Univ. of Tenn.			
	1974		1975		1974		1975		1974		1975		1974		1975		1974		1975	
	N		P		N		P		N		P		N		P		N		P	
1. Order and routine.	95	90	75	78	99	90	72	76	93	82	78	76	93	95	75	68	100	91	61	64
2. Clear cut lines of authority.	96	73	41	39	77	66	38	36	78	53	56	23	82	64	39	27	75	72	50	32
3. Originality and creativity.	43	49	62	76	29	68	48	80	52	35	78	35	64	32	86	68	57	45	79	68
4. Dedicated service to humanity.	93	90	88	95	97	100	96	90	93	88	81	71	93	90	91	86	93	82	93	73
5. Moving ritual and ceremony.	24	24	22	10	14	18	22	18	26	18	26	12	23	5	5	9	21	23	7	0
6. Hard work.	87	93	78	78	96	98	71	92	81	76	63	59	91	91	66	64	89	86	71	55
7. Clearly defined work tasks; each person is responsible for her job and her job alone.	51	42	22	24	49	32	29	20	30	53	26	24	55	23	27	27	29	41	11	5
8. Close supervision and direction	64	66	38	27	65	64	39	26	59	41	30	41	59	36	27	32	68	50	25	14
9. Exercise of imagination and insight.	58	51	67	71	36	76	58	82	63	24	85	47	82	64	91	100	50	55	82	77
10. Religious inspiration and calling.	67	68	71	83	52	48	49	42	52	29	44	29	30	14	39	27	50	32	79	41
11. Meticulousness.	47	51	37	37	52	46	25	28	48	29	37	18	70	64	55	50	71	59	39	36
12. Job security.	70	59	68	71	75	82	71	74	67	71	63	71	73	72	70	68	82	68	54	73
13. Human drama and excitement.	64	66	51	66	62	66	46	58	52	29	48	18	55	41	52	50	68	68	61	45
14. High technical skill.	78	80	64	73	84	88	61	70	85	76	59	82	91	86	86	68	82	82	75	64
15. Emotional control and restraint.	88	90	79	71	91	88	72	78	81	82	74	82	91	91	86	82	100	95	64	68
16. Frequent innovation in the solution of problems.	71	37	57	41	58	46	46	42	56	53	56	29	77	41	82	55	61	59	79	55
17. An occupation highly respected in the community.	91	54	58	49	91	52	75	46	78	53	52	35	91	73	70	68	93	82	68	36
18. Solid intellectual content.	72	41	63	29	77	52	61	44	70	41	52	35	66	50	61	68	75	73	71	45
19. Demonstrating care and concern for others in an immediate and tangible way.	91	61	91	66	97	56	96	56	90	53	89	53	95	77	98	86	89	73	93	82

TABLE XV

SUMMARY STATISTICS OF RESPONSES OF EACH SCHOOL GROUP
TO THE SEMANTIC SCALE FOR THE CONCEPT
"MY REAL SELF" IN 1975

	SCALE										
School	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	F
Baptist	5.37	5.69	6.03	5.71	5.54	6.37	3.49	5.57	4.57	4.46	
Methodist	5.85	5.65	5.94	5.85	5.67	6.29	3.69	5.77	4.29	4.19	
St. Joseph	5.56	5.33	5.28	5.61	5.39	6.56	3.61	5.44	4.61	4.22	
M.S.U.	5.40	5.25	5.90	5.65	5.30	6.25	3.30	5.00	3.85	4.00	
Univ. of Tenn.	5.69	4.85	6.00	6.08	5.85	6.39	3.62	5.39	3.92	4.15	
											Across Schools - 1.20

TABLE XVI

SUMMARY STATISTICS OF RESPONSES OF EACH SCHOOL GROUP
TO THE SEMANTIC SCALE FOR THE CONCEPT
"MOST R.N.'s (OTHER THAN MY INSTRUCTORS) WHOM
I'VE OBSERVED DURING MY CLINICAL EXPERIENCES"
IN 1975

	SCALE										
School	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	F
Baptist	4.54	5.40	4.97	5.77	5.40	5.46	6.03	4.80	5.00	6.11	
Methodist	4.44	5.52	5.23	6.06	5.65	6.06	6.29	5.65	5.04	6.13	
St. Joseph	4.33	5.39	5.56	5.89	5.22	5.33	6.11	5.28	4.89	6.06	
M.S.U.	4.40	5.85	5.75	4.95	5.25	5.70	6.10	4.75	4.65	5.70	
Univ. of Tenn.	4.31	5.92	5.39	5.23	5.69	5.54	6.08	5.00	5.00	6.39	
											Across Schools - 0.75

TABLE XVII

SUMMARY STATISTICS OF RESPONSES OF EACH SCHOOL GROUP
TO THE SEMANTIC SCALE FOR THE CONCEPT
"MY NURSING EDUCATION PROGRAM"
IN 1975

	SCALE										
School	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	F
Baptist	6.83	3.11	6.00	6.46	6.40	6.63	5.89	5.83	4.71	6.80	
Methodist	6.65	3.83	6.04	6.65	6.52	6.56	6.10	6.40	4.29	6.90	
St. Joseph	6.72	4.56	5.67	6.50	6.22	6.56	6.44	6.00	4.89	6.78	
M.S.U.	5.80	5.10	4.95	6.15	6.30	6.20	6.30	6.10	5.10	6.35	
Univ. of Tenn.	6.08	4.08	5.23	5.69	5.15	6.39	4.92	5.85	4.23	6.62	
										Across Schools -	1.49

TABLE XVIII

SUMMARY STATISTICS OF RESPONSES OF EACH SCHOOL GROUP
TO THE SEMANTIC SCALE FOR THE CONCEPT
"MY FELLOW STUDENTS IN THIS NURSING PROGRAM"
IN 1975

	SCALE										
School	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	F
Baptist	5.83	4.40	4.20	4.83	5.14	3.66	4.86	4.91	5.49	4.86	
Methodist	6.15	4.40	4.17	5.25	5.77	3.98	5.54	5.69	5.90	5.33	
St. Joseph	6.11	4.89	3.67	5.44	5.50	4.00	5.44	5.10	5.11	5.17	
M.S.U.	5.40	4.20	4.15	5.45	5.30	4.00	5.50	5.55	6.00	5.50	
Univ. of Tenn.	5.77	3.69	4.31	5.08	5.85	3.85	5.46	5.77	6.00	5.08	
										Across Schools -	2.07

TABLE XIX

SUMMARY STATISTICS OF RESPONSES OF EACH SCHOOL GROUP
TO THE SEMANTIC SCALE FOR THE CONCEPT
"MY OVERALL IMPRESSION OF MY NURSING INSTRUCTORS"
IN 1975

School	SCALE 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	F
Baptist	5.03	6.26	4.06	5.06	4.49	5.37	6.00	5.89	6.49	5.60	
Methodist	4.75	6.25	3.94	5.65	4.60	6.04	6.54	5.81	6.42	6.29	
St. Joseph	5.89	6.17	4.28	5.78	4.17	6.39	6.06	5.56	6.50	6.28	
M.S.U.	6.60	5.90	4.65	5.25	4.25	5.90	5.95	5.85	6.30	5.85	
Univ. of Tenn.	5.69	5.54	4.08	5.62	5.00	4.23	5.77	6.54	6.15	5.77	
											Across Schools - 0.82

TABLE XX

SUMMARY STATISTICS OF RESPONSES OF EACH SCHOOL GROUP
TO THE SEMANTIC SCALE FOR THE CONCEPT
"MY CONCEPT OF THE IDEAL NURSE"
IN 1975

School	SCALE 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	F
Baptist	4.14	6.94	6.71	5.37	4.63	5.86	6.43	6.26	6.11	6.83	
Methodist	4.15	6.85	6.52	5.29	4.63	5.67	6.75	6.69	6.58	6.73	
St. Joseph	4.39	6.83	6.28	5.89	4.00	6.17	6.33	6.00	6.06	6.78	
M.S.U.	4.25	6.95	6.15	5.60	4.85	6.65	6.80	6.50	6.05	6.80	
Univ. of Tenn.	5.31	6.92	6.77	6.00	4.39	6.15	6.62	6.39	5.54	6.92	
											Across Schools - 0.47

TABLE XXI

SUMMARY STATISTICS OF RESPONSES OF EACH SCHOOL GROUP
TO THE SEMANTIC SCALE FOR THE CONCEPT
"MY CONCEPT OF AN IDEAL NURSING PROGRAM"
IN 1975

	SCALE										
School	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	F
Baptist	6.46	6.80	4.14	5.37	6.40	4.83	6.77	6.83	6.91	6.77	
Methodist	6.54	6.63	4.63	5.60	6.54	4.46	6.77	6.79	6.60	6.69	
St. Joseph	6.61	6.78	4.72	5.06	6.56	5.17	6.61	6.67	6.78	6.67	
M.S.U.	6.80	6.80	5.50	5.10	6.75	5.65	6.70	6.90	6.70	6.95	
Univ. of Tenn.	6.77	6.85	5.15	5.15	6.46	5.39	6.77	6.85	6.69	6.23	
											Across Schools - 0.92

TABLE XXII

SUMMARY STATISTICS OF RESPONSES OF EACH SCHOOL GROUP
TO THE SEMANTIC SCALE FOR THE CONCEPT
"MY IDEAL SELF"
IN 1975

	SCALE										
School	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	F
Baptist	6.57	6.09	5.40	3.37	4.80	6.83	5.49	4.71	6.29	6.49	
Methodist	6.52	6.17	5.92	3.54	4.73	6.71	6.15	4.00	6.44	6.42	
St. Joseph	6.61	5.56	5.89	3.44	5.50	6.83	5.50	4.67	6.28	6.11	
M.S.U.	6.55	6.15	5.55	3.95	6.10	6.60	5.85	4.65	6.40	6.75	
Univ. of Tenn.	6.85	6.31	5.77	4.08	5.31	6.62	5.69	4.46	6.23	6.85	
											Across Schools - 0.88

The survey was undertaken to discover the significant differences, if any, which existed among the student bodies of the five schools of nursing involved in this consortium project. Significance at the 0.10 level or beyond was obtained on only twenty of the 240 variables studied (counting repeats across years). This number lies within the realm which could be anticipated by chance, indicating, as an examination of the tabular results, that significant difference is lacking in a comparison of the five student bodies involved on the variables shown for study. Longitudinal follow-up of these students is needed to provide data on the holding power over time of the many similarities and few differences noted.

APPENDIX A
SUMMARY DESCRIPTION OF THE DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS OF THE STUDY

All students were asked to respond to a biographical questionnaire*. For other data collection purposes the entering students were randomly divided into three response groups, and each response group completed four additional instruments. This random division was used in order to make possible representative coverage of more variables and variable dimensions with different instruments while holding the time involvement of each student to a minimum.

The categories and data collection instruments are as follows:

I. Personality-Value Measures:
   - A. Personal Orientation Inventory-a 150 item, forced choice instrument measuring the degree of self-actualization or placement on Maslow's Hierarchy of Basic Human Needs. (Latter is one of organizing foci of core curriculum). Author: Dr. Everett Shostrom.
   - B. 16 P.F.-a 187 item multiple choice, factor analytically developed personality questionnaire measuring sixteen major dimensions of human personality. Authors: Dr. Raymond Cattell and Dr. Herbert Eber.
   - C. Study of Values-145 item instrument with responses to be rank ordered. Measures the relative prominence of six basic interests or motives in personality based on value or evaluative attitudes. Authors: Dr. Gordon Allport, Dr. Phillip Vernon, Dr. Gardner Lindsey.

II. Attitudes Toward Nursing:
   - A. Nursing Checklist-a brief 20 item check-list indicating characteristics perceived as important to nursing and characteristics of importance to the respondent.
   - B. CTN Scale-a brief 25 item, multiple choice instrument, pertaining to nursing, asking for responses in three categories; ideal situation, situation considered ideal by nursing instructors, actual or real situation.
   - C. Perception of Nurses-variable length, semantic differential instrument consisting of twenty dichotomous adjective scales describing various qualities (concepts) associated with nursing and nurses.

III. Perception and/or Reactions to Others:
   - A. Social Reaction Inventory-a 20 item, forced choice instrument, measuring beliefs concerning our relations with others.
   - B. Humanitarianism Scale-a 28 item, Likert-scaled instrument measuring degree of humanitarianism or concern for others.
   - C. Cynicism Scale-a 36 item, Likert-scaled instrument measuring degree of cynicism or skepticism or concern with others.

*See Appendix B.

IV. Personaltiy Structure:

A. Rokeach Dogmatism Scale-a 50 item, Likert-scaled instrument measuring cognitive structure, i.e. degree of open or closed-mindedness.

B. JIM Scale-1 50 item, Likert-scaled instrument measuring student motivation toward school.

C. Short Form-Minnesota Survey of Opinions-a 31 item Likert-scaled instrument measuring morale and general adjustment.

APPENDIX B
BIOGRAPHICAL DATA
QUESTIONNAIRE

DIRECTIONS: Please respond carefully and accureately to each item. Leave blank only those items which do not apply to you. Fill out all other items.

A. PERSONAL:

Sex_____ Age_____ Race_____

Marital Status_____ Number of Children_____
Ages of Children_____

Date of Birth_____
Month Day Year

Place of Birth_____
City State

Number of brothers and sisters_____
Number of brothers and sisters older than you_____

In how many different cities, towns, etc. have you resided up to this time?_____

Before entering this nursing program were you residing in: (check one)

_____Memphis?
_____Shelby County, outside Memphis city limits?
_____Other city of above 100,000 population?
_____Small city of between 30,000-100,000 population?
_____Town of 10,000-30,000 population?
_____Samll town of less than 10,000 population?
_____Rural area?

Did you complete high school in the same place as specified in the item above?

_____Yes.
_____No. If No, did you complete high school in:
_____ Memphis?
_____ Shelby County, outside Memphis city limits?
_____ Other city of above 100,000 population?
_____ Small city of between 30,000-100,000 population?
_____ Town of 10,000-30,000 population?
_____ Small town of less than 10,000 population?
_____ Rural area?

In what state did you complete high school?_____

When did you complete high school?_____

During high school did you live with: (check one)

_____ Both parents
_____ One parent
_____ Other (specify)_____

If you did not live iwth both parents, were your parents:

_____ Separated
_____ Divorced
_____ Deceased_____ ONe parent;_____ Both parents

For each parent and/or guardian (specify) indicate his/her occupation and level of education:

Father	Mother
Occupation:_____	Occupation:_____
Level of schooling (check one).	Level of schooling (check one).
_____ less than 8 years	_____ less than 8 years
_____ 8-12 years	_____ 8-12 years
_____ High school diploma	_____ High school diploma
_____ 1-2 years college or trade school	_____ 1-2 years college or trade school
_____ 3-4 years college or trade school	_____ 3-4 years college or trade school
_____ Bachelor's Degree	_____ Bachelor's Degree
_____ Master's Degree	_____ Master's Degree
_____ Beyond Master's Degree	_____ Beyond Master's Degree

Is your family's annual income approximately (check one).

_____ Less than $5,000
_____ Between $5,000-$10,000
_____ Between $10,000-$20,000
_____ Between $20,000-$35,000
_____ Between $35,000-$50,000
_____ Above $50,000

In high school did you work (check one).

_____ Part-time
_____ Full-time
_____ Not at all

List the type(s) of jobs you held in high school:_____
_____

Approximately how much did you earn from these jobs?

$_____ per hour
day (Circle one)
week
month

Have you worked during the summer before entering this program?
_____ No
_____ Yes. If yes, at what type of job?_____. What was your salary? $_____per_____.

INTERESTS:

In high school what was (were your favorite subject(s)?_____
_____

In high school waht was(werr) your favorite extra-curricular activity (activities)?_____

What were your high school major and minor subjects?
Major(s)_____ Minor(s)_____

Have you attended college or trade school before entering nursing?

_____ No
_____ Yes. If yes -
How many years? _____
Where?_____

Have you held a full-time job (other than a summer job) prior to entering nursing?

_____ No
_____ Yes If yes, what type(s) of job?_____

What is your favorite sport?_____

What is (are) your hobby (hobbies)?_____
_____

What is your favorite way to spend leisure time?_____

NURSING:

Why did you decide to enter nursing?_____
_____
_____
_____

At what age did you decide on nursing?_____

Were you influenced in your choice of nursing by another person?_____No
_____Yes

If yes, who was the other person (relative, friend, counsellor, etc.)?
_____. Was this person a (check one)____Nurse
____Doctor ____Other health professional ____ Not connected with health professions.

Why did you choose this particular school of nursing?_____
_____
_____.

Of the expenses (tuition, fees, living expenses, etc) connected with your nursing education, approximately what part or percentage is being financed by:

_____ your parents or family
_____ your earnings or savings
_____ scholarships
_____ loans
_____ other (specify)_____

CAREER EXPECTATIONS:

Do you expect to make nursing a life-long career?_____

Do you plan to work after marriage?_____

If you plan to change occupations, for what other occupation will you prepare?_____.

What type of nursing do you plan to do after graduation?_____
_____
_____.

Do you plan to continue your education after completing this nursing program?

_____ No
_____ Yes If yes, what are your plans_____
_____.

Briefly describe your concept of an "ideal" nurse._____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____.

Did you apply to other schools of nursing?_____
If yes, how many?_____ Why did you come to this school rather than the others?_____

_____

APPENDIX C
DEFINITIONS OF TERMS

Factors of the Personal Orientation Inventory:

Time incompetence - Characterized by poor discrimination between past and future excessive concern for the past or the future relative to the present and disorientation to the present; past oriented subjects are characterized by guilt, regret, remorse, resentment; future oriented subjects are characterized by idealized goals or expectations, fear and obsessive worry; present oriented subjects are characterized by meaningless activity and unreflective concentration.

Time competence - Characterized by full living in the here and now, ability to tie the future to the present in meaningful continuity, aspirations tied meaninfully to present working goals and faith in the future.

Other directedness -Characterized by behavioral control feelings of fear or anxiety; oversensitivity to "others" in matters of external conformity; highest gaol is approved by others; sometimes ovsessive, insatiable needs for affection and reassurance.

Inner directedness -Characterized by apparent independence but with internal obeying of piloting influenced by parents and other "authority" figures; guided by these internal motivations rather than external influences.

Self-actualizing values - High scores: holds and lives by Maslow's self-actualizing values.
Low scores: rejects values of self-actualizing people.

Existentiality - High score: flexibility and good judgement in applying value to own life.
Low score: rigid holding of values to extreme of compulsion or dogmatism.

Feeling Reactivity -High score: sensitivity to one's own needs and feelings.
Low score: insensitivity to one's own needs and feelings.

Spontaneity -	High score: ability to express feelings in spontaneous action. Low score: fearful of behaviorally expressing feelings.
Self Regard -	High score: ability to like oneself for one's strenths. Low score: low self worth.
Self Acceptance -	High score: acceptance of one's self in spite of deficiencies. Low score: inability to accept one's weaknesses.
Nature of Man, Constructive -	High score: sees man as essentially good; high synergy. Low score: sees man as bad or evil; lacks synergy.
Synergy -	High score: ability to perceive opposites of life as meaningfully related. Low score: sees opposites of life as antagonistic.
Acceptance of Agression -	High score: ability to accept one's own anger and aggression as natural. Low score: denial of one's own feelings of anger and aggression.
Capacity for Intimate Contact -	High score: ability to develop meaningful, contactual relationships with other humans. Low score: difficulty with interpersonal relationships.

Factors of the 16 P.F. test:

Factor	High Score	Low Score
A	Outgoing, warmhearted, easy-going, participating	Reserved, detached, critical, aloof
B	Bright	Dull
C	High ego strength	Low ego strength
E	Dominant	Submissive
F	Enthusiastic, happy-go-lucky	Sober, serious
G	Persistent, moralistic	Expedient
H	Venturesome, socially bold	Shy, timid
I	Sensitive, clinging, over-protected	Self reliant, realistic
L	Suspicious, hard to fool	Trusting, accepting
M	Imaginative, absent-minded	Practical, down to earth
N	Shrewdness	Artlessness
O	Apprehensive, insecure	Self-assured, placid, complacent
Q_1	Radicalism	Conservativism
Q_2	Self-sufficiency	Group adherence
Q_3	Compulsive, socially precise, following self-image	Undisciplined, lax, careless
Q_4	Tense, driven, frustrated	Relaxed, tranquil, composed

APPENDIX D
SEMANTIC SCALES USED TO MEASURE
ATTITUDES TOWARD NURSING

The purpose of this test is to measure the meanings certain concepts hold for you by having you judge them against a series of descriptive scales. In taking this test, please make your judgments on the basis of what these things mean to you. On each page of this test, you will find a different concept to be judged and beneath it a set of scales. You are to rate the concept on each of these scales in order.

HERE IS HOW YOU ARE TO USE THESE SCALES

If you feel that the concept at the top of the page is very closely related to one end of the scale, you should place your checkmark as follows:

fair_X_:____:____:____:____:____:____: unfair

or

fair____:____:____:____:____:____:_X_: unfair

If you feel that the concept is very closely related to one or the other end of the scale (but not extremely), you should place your checkmark as follows:

strong____:_X_:____:____:____:____:____: weak

or

strong____:____:____:____:____:_X_:____: weak

If the concpet seems only slightly related to one side as opposed to the other side (but is not really neutral), you should check as follows:

active____:____:_X_:____:____:____:____: passive

or

active____:____:____:____:_X_:____:____: passive

The direction toward which you check, of course, depends upon which of the two ends of the scale seems more characteristic of the thing you are judging.

If you consider the concept to be neutral on the scale, both sides of the scale equally associated with the concept, or if the scale is completely irrelevant, unrelated to the concept, you should place your checkmark in the middle space:

safe____:____:____:_X_:____:____:____: dangerous

IMPORTANT: (1) Place your checkmarks in the middle of spaces, not on the boundaries.

____:____:_X_:____:____:____:____:

this not this

(2) Be sure to check every scale for every concept; do not omit any.
(3) Never put more than one check-mark on a single scale

Do not look back and forth through the items. Do not try to remember how you checked similar items earlier in the test. Make each item a separate and independent judgment. Work at fairly high speed through this test. Do not worry or puzzle over individual items. It is your first impressions, your immediate "feelings" about the items, that are important.

MY REAL SELF

Believing____:____:____:____:____:____:____: Skeptical

Pessimistic____:____:____:____:____:____:____: Optimistic

Insensitive____:____:____:____:____:____:____: Sensitive

Congenial____:____:____:____:____:____:____: Quarrelsome

Successful____:____:____:____:____:____:____: Unsuccessful

Disloyal____:____:____:____:____:____:____: Loyal

Tenacious____:____:____:____:____:____:____: Yielding

Rash____:____:____:____:____:____:____: Cautious

Calm____:____:____:____:____:____:____: Excitable

Egotistic____:____:____:____:____:____:____: Altruistic

MOST R.N.'S (OTHER THAN MY INSTRUCTORS) WHOM
I'VE OBSERVED DURING MY CLINICAL EXPERIENCES

Lax ____:____:____:____:____:____:____: Domineering

Excitable ____:____:____:____:____:____:____: Calm

Changeable ____:____:____:____:____:____:____: Stable

Progressive ____:____:____:____:____:____:____: Regressive

Optimistic ____:____:____:____:____:____:____: Pessimistic

Active ____:____:____:____:____:____:____: Passive

Bungling ____:____:____:____:____:____:____: Skillful

Believing ____:____:____:____:____:____:____: Skeptical

Rational ____:____:____:____:____:____:____: Intuitive

Unimportant ____:____:____:____:____:____:____: Important

MY NURSING EDUCATION PROGRAM

Good _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: Bad

Constrained _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: Free

Simple _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: Complex

Meaningful _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: Meaningless

Negative _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: Positive

Regressive _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: Progressive

Boring _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: Interesting

Active _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: Passive

Cooperative _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: Competitive

Unimportant _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: Important

MY FELLOW STUDENTS IN THIS NURSING PROGRAM

Loyal _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: Disloyal

Altruistic _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: Egotistic

Lax _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: Domineering

Skeptical _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: Believing

Unsuccessful _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: Successful

Tenacious _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: Yielding

Optimistic _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: Pessimistic

Sensitive _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: Insensitive

Quarrelsome _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: Congenial

Rash _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: Cautious

MY OVERALL IMPRESSION OF
MY NURSING INSTRUCTORS

Excitable ____:____:____:____:____:____:____: Calm

Progressive ____:____:____:____:____:____:____: Regressive

Egotistic ____:____:____:____:____:____:____: Altruistic

Stable ____:____:____:____:____:____:____: Changeable

Intuitive ____:____:____:____:____:____:____: Rational

Interesting ____:____:____:____:____:____:____: Boring

Wise ____:____:____:____:____:____:____: Foolish

Pessimistic ____:____:____:____:____:____:____: Optimistic

Bungling ____:____:____:____:____:____:____: Skillful

Believing ____:____:____:____:____:____:____: Skeptical

MY CONCEPT OF THE IDEAL NURSE

Intuitive ____:____:____:____:____:____:____: Rational

Skillful ____:____:____:____:____:____:____: Bungling

Optimistic ____:____:____:____:____:____:____: Pessimistic

Stable ____:____:____:____:____:____:____: Changeable

Domineering ____:____:____:____:____:____:____: Lax

Calm ____:____:____:____:____:____:____: Excitable

Regressive ____:____:____:____:____:____:____: Progressive

Passive ____:____:____:____:____:____:____: Active

Believing ____:____:____:____:____:____:____: Skeptical

Unimportant ____:____:____:____:____:____:____: Important

MY CONCEPT OF AN IDEAL NURSING PROGRAM

Active	_____	: _____	: _____	: _____	: _____	: _____	: _____	: Passive
Positive	_____	: _____	: _____	: _____	: _____	: _____	: _____	: Negative
Free	_____	: _____	: _____	: _____	: _____	: _____	: _____	: Constrained
Complex	_____	: _____	: _____	: _____	: _____	: _____	: _____	: Simple
Regressive	_____	: _____	: _____	: _____	: _____	: _____	: _____	: Progressive
Competitive	_____	: _____	: _____	: _____	: _____	: _____	: _____	: Cooperative
Important	_____	: _____	: _____	: _____	: _____	: _____	: _____	: Unimportant
Interesting	_____	: _____	: _____	: _____	: _____	: _____	: _____	: Boring
Bad	_____	: _____	: _____	: _____	: _____	: _____	: _____	: Good
Meaningless	_____	: _____	: _____	: _____	: _____	: _____	: _____	: Meaningful

MY IDEAL SELF

Successful	_____	: _____	: _____	: _____	: _____	: _____	: _____	: Unsuccessful
Sensitive	_____	: _____	: _____	: _____	: _____	: _____	: _____	: Insensitive
Skeptical	_____	: _____	: _____	: _____	: _____	: _____	: _____	: Believing
Yielding	_____	: _____	: _____	: _____	: _____	: _____	: _____	: Tenacious
Excitable	_____	: _____	: _____	: _____	: _____	: _____	: _____	: Calm
Loyal	_____	: _____	: _____	: _____	: _____	: _____	: _____	: Disloyal
Rash	_____	: _____	: _____	: _____	: _____	: _____	: _____	: Cautious
Egotistic	_____	: _____	: _____	: _____	: _____	: _____	: _____	: Altruistic
Optimistic	_____	: _____	: _____	: _____	: _____	: _____	: _____	: Pessimistic
Congenial	_____	: _____	: _____	: _____	: _____	: _____	: _____	: Quarrelsome